

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/017,642	12/14/2001	Rohit Ramani	1488.011US1	6405	
21186 75	10/18/2006		EXAM	INER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.			NG, CHRISTINE Y		
P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLI			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2616		
			DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			1
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/017,642	RAMANI ET AL.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christine Ng	2616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addr	ess
THE REPLY FILED <u>25 September 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE 1	THIS APPLICATION IN CON	IDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to on this application, applicant must timely file one of the for places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in confollowing time periods:	ollowing replies: (1) an amen Notice of Appeal (with appe npliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	dment, affidavit, or other evide al fee) in compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin	-		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later	than SIX MONTHS from the mai	ling date of the final rejection.	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.0		EN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED	WITHIN TWO
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date seen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more parent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	on which the petition under 37 CF n and the corresponding amount statutory period for reply original	of the fee. The appropriate extension y set in the final Office action; or (2) a	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in co	ompliance with 37 CFR 41.3	7 must be filed within two mont	hs of the date
of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any	y extension thereof (37 CFR	41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal o	f the appeal.
Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply mus	st be filed within the time per	iod set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a	a).
MENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection (a) They raise new issues that would require further (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE by (c) They are not deemed to place the application in the contract of th	consideration and/or search elow);	(see NOTE below);	
appeal; and/or			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling	·	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a		of Non Compliant Amendment	(PTOL 324)
. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection		or Non-Compliant Amendment	(F10L-324).
. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be		separate timely filed amendmo	ent canceling
the non-allowable claim(s).	o anomabio ii oabiiiikoa iii a	sopulate, amoly mod amonam	one canceling
For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): how the new or amended claims would be rejected is particles that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	a) will not be entered, or orovided below or appended.	b) 🗌 will be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
FFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		rentuu aan ar ee ee	-41 4
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	, but before or on the date of and sufficient reasons why t	filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>ner</u> he affidavit or other evidence is	<u>ot</u> be entered s necessary
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of fil entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed t showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necess	o overcome <u>all</u> rejections un	der appeal and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
0. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explana REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
1. 🛛 The request for reconsideration has been considered	but does NOT place the app	olication in condition for allowa	nce because:
See Continuation Sheet. 2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	•
3.		wall	
	-	HUY D. VU	
		- · - · - ·	

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600 Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Referring to the argument that Chapman et al do not disclose an impending congestion indication (page 12, line 22 to page 13, line 18): As shown in Figure 2, "the control unit 200 of node 104 is operative to detect and foresee congestion at the node 104, in response to which it will generate a control signal" (Column 5, lines 12-15). The control signal "generated by control unit 200 takes the form of a congestion stamp applied to a control packet released from the node 104 to the transport ring 102", and each control packet has a congestion notification field. Any intermediate node along the path can set the bits in the congestion notification field of a control packet to "congested", "thus indicating that congestion is being experienced or is being forecasted at the intermediate node". Refer to Column 5, lines 21-32. Furthermore, by "estimating the network data occupancy level, congestion at the node can be effectively foreseen and controlled" (abstract, lines 11-13). Therefore, the congestion notification field is used for forecasting congestion, which is impending congestion.

Referring to the argument that Lee et al do not disclose a congestion alleviation indication (page 13, line 19 to page 14, line 13): Lee et al disclose a congestion control mechanism in which each network element can inform other network elements of congestion by setting the Explicit Forward Congestion Indicator (EFCI) bit in the header of each data cell. A network element in an impending congested state or in a currently congested state may set the EFCI bit. A network element that is not in a congested state or an impending congested state will not modify the value of the EFCI indication. If the EFCI bit is set, the system will lower its cell rate to control congestion. Once the congestion is alleviated, the EFCI bit will be set back to "0" to indicate that the network element is not in a congested state or will not be in a congested state. Refer to Column 2, lines 25-41 and Column 3, line 51 to Column 4, line 10. Even though the EFCI bit does not always equate to congestion alleviation (when there was no prior congestion), the EFCI bit does sometimes equate to congestion alleviation (when there was prior congestion). The claim only claims that after congestion has been alleviated, the header is marked with a congestion alleviation header. Lee et al similarly discloses that after congestion has been alleviated, the EFCI bit changes back to "0" since the system does not need to lower its cell rate anymore, which reads on the "congestion alleviation indication".